



## Public Information Meeting

### Secondary Planning Strategy and Land Use Bylaw Amendments- Lantz Secondary Planning Strategy

October, 7 2025  
Lloyd E Matheson Centre

## ATTENDANCE

### Staff:

John Woodford, Director of Planning and Development

Rachel Gilbert, Manager of Planning

Hannah Grosvenor, Administrative Assistant

### Members of the Public:

45 members, including 3 Councillors: Councillor Mitchell, Councillor Merriam, and Councillor Tingley

1.	Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.
	The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm by John Woodford, beginning with a land acknowledgement.
2.	Secondary Planning Strategy and Land Use Bylaw Amendments- Lantz Secondary Planning Strategy - Presentation from Rachel Gilbert
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A resident asked how many homes would the plan support. Staff estimated a few thousand with a variety of housing density, and both serviced and un-serviced areas.</li><li>A resident described their current lack of water on an un-serviced lot and was concerned further development would exacerbate the situation. Staff reminded residents that this is a concept plan, and consultation will happen during the plan review.</li></ul>



- A resident questioned if an environmental assessment for the wildlife had been done, and expressed specific concern for the turtles. Staff replied that a desk study had been done that identified potential wetlands. Staff clarified that the land could be wet, but is not considered a wetland until it is officially delineated. Staff anticipate that every application for development will need a detailed look at whether there are wetlands, among other things, at the cost of the developer.
- A resident shared that they had lost a family member in recent floods, attributed to climate change. They asked why the municipality can't leave the land alone. Staff explained that any one who owns private land has the right to develop, and that the municipality creates bylaws to monitor development. The only way to keep the land protected and from development would be if the Government purchased the land. Planning is a balance, and development can ensure green spaces and watercourse protection. The province has their own strategy for land use to protect ecosystems.
- A resident cited page 33 of the report and again asked about wetlands. Staff explained again that land that is wet is not the same as land that has been officially delineated as a wetland. Developers will hire a professional to decide the boundaries of wetlands in their area.
- A resident questioned under whose authority a map had changed. Staff explained that the map in question was a previous version of a concept plan.
- The same resident expressed concern for the water table and the effect development may have on it. Staff agreed and reminded residents that the developer will need to provide the research by professional on the lot before developing, and that any land that the province deems is a wetland cannot be developed on.
- A resident cited a study from April, 2024 that indicated rare species have been observed in this area. Staff confirmed that was reviewed by the consultant.
- A resident asked where the municipal flood plain map was. Staff explained that that could be found on the zoning map on the municipal website, and reminded residents that development was not permitted in high-risk flood plain areas.



- A resident questioned what was commercial and residential on the plan. Staff explained the map that indicated the different areas.
- A resident asked if the goal was to become Halifax. Staff said this was not the goal.
- A resident noted that this area has been a growth reserve area since 2000 and questioned why it was just now being brought forward for development discussions. Staff explained that growth management areas and growth reserve areas were created in the 2000 Official Community Plan to indicate the next places where growth could happen. Council can decide not to develop these areas, but the studies and concepts are there to look at it in the future.
- A resident questioned if Housing Accelerator Fund money was funding the plan's developments. Staff clarified that the project is one of the projects identified in the HAF application.
- A resident raised concerns about the traffic, and questioned the traffic strategies. Staff noted that our communities were not created with a grid plan, and the proposed roads in the plan should reduce traffic congestion.
- The resident shared that they have submitted many complaints to the province about traffic. Staff reminded residents that this plan is not set in stone and moving ahead tomorrow; this is a concept. All concerns are valid and are an important part of the conversation.
- The resident then asked how much say individuals have in this plan. Staff referred residents to their councillors, and suggested that they have a lot of power at this level. Staff suggested being informed, respectful, and making good arguments.
- A resident asked what Institutional Use was for. Staff clarified locations for potential institutional uses but that there were no plans for specific institutional uses at this time, but it was designated as an area good for larger institutional use if needed. The intent is to plan for complete communities.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A resident asked if there were other areas developed in a similar fashion to use as a comparison. Staff suggested the corridor as the best comparison, specifically Clayton Developments and Kiln Creek.</li><li>• A resident asked if plans had been considered for emergency services. Staff explained that council will look into that. Secondary access roads are proposed for the area, allowing for multiple points of exit. Staff noted that this plan would take decades to fully roll out.</li><li>• The resident asked why the municipality doesn't do its own studies instead of asking the developer to do them. Staff explained that developers hire professionals to do the studies. These professionals are licensed and have professional reputations to maintain.</li><li>• A resident expressed concern that the schools and swim lessons were at capacity, and suggested an access road similar to the Sydney port access road. Staff acknowledged that schools have historically been reactive to growth, but are starting to think ahead. New schools are within department of education's jurisdiction, not municipal. Institutional Use space has been designated should they feel they need another school, and the consultants did talk to the NS DOE about this concept.</li><li>• The resident suggested speaking to educators in the schools.</li><li>• A resident noted that Maple Ridge Elementary almost closed years ago.</li><li>• A resident inquired about water for proposed development. Staff explained that this particular area would require an infrastructure master plan to look at how to service the area. Looking at the larger picture, the municipality is always looking at how much water is needed and how much water they have.</li><li>• A resident asked about the limit for pumping from Grand Lake. Staff clarified that the Department of Environment and Climate Change regulates that, but noted that the Enfield water treatment plant has the capacity for more, and staff are working on that.</li><li>• The resident asked if there was a plan to obtain more water. Staff again explained that the municipality is always looking at how much water is needed</li></ul>
--	---



and how much water they have. Studies are ongoing as each phase of new development starts.

- The resident mentioned a number of developments in progression and asked where the water was coming from for those. Staff reiterated that the municipality is always working on water for current phases and looking ahead at next phases.
- A resident asked who else was drawing on Grand Lake. Staff didn't have a specific answer, but confirmed it was a few small systems.
- A resident asked how Rural Use (RU) zoned land could be developed. Staff clarified the Land Use Bylaw for RU land, and confirmed that developments could occur on existing roads but no new roads could be created.
- A resident requested a time estimate for this plan. Staff confirmed that the plan is to hold a public hearing before the end of the year.
- A resident expressed concern that water was an afterthought to development, and asked what was preventing the municipality from putting in water and sewage first. The resident referenced their tax bill in another province and compared it to their current East Hants tax bill. Staff explained that water is not an afterthought. Hydrogeological studies are required for new unserviced developments. In serviced areas, no development is approved until the municipality knows there is enough water. The infrastructure master plan is to plan for water. Staff reminded residents that concepts don't happen if the services are not there.
- A resident asked if the Infrastructure Master Plan was taking climate change into account. Staff explained that the plan wasn't done yet, but assumed so.
- A resident asked for clarification about the zoning. Staff confirmed it was Rural Use (RU) and flood plains, and had been RU for several years.
- The resident shared that they owned Agricultural Reserve (AR) land and couldn't develop it, and referenced their taxes. Staff explained that the point of AR was to reserve agricultural land. However, anyone can apply for rezoning or request



it be reviewed in the next plan review. Staff clarified that tax code is not the same as zoning.

- A resident questioned how this plan would be paid for, specifically whether the cost of water infrastructure would be passed on to developers or tax payers. Staff explained that infrastructure charges are in addition to taxes.
- The resident inquired about a specific location and how much they would pay for infrastructure. Staff clarified that developers pay to put in the pipes, and that off-site charges get paid for on a separate budget by infrastructure charges and water rates.
- A resident asked if the municipality gets any sort of incentives from developers. Staff clarified that they do not. Developers pay taxes and permit fees like everyone else.
- The resident inquired about a target growth or population. Staff replied that this is done indirectly through the growth reserve areas.
- A resident asked what time frame would be for these developments. Staff replied that this would take in excess of a decade, and the purpose of this plan was to plan ahead.
- The resident inquired where the growth reserve area in Belnan was, and expressed concerns about traffic in that area. Staff showed the resident on a map where the area was, and acknowledged that it had yet to be studied.
- A resident asked if water studies look at the surrounding area. Staff explained that hydrogeological studies state what a sustainable yield is for that area, which is converted to the number of houses that can be supported.
- The resident reiterated that they just want water.
- A resident asked where run-off water goes when things are developed. Staff explained where stormwater drainage plans are required.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A resident summarized what they were hearing, stating that the public is concerned about water, and that residents of rural areas specifically have water source concerns.</li><li>• A resident asked if this plan moves forward to council, do they make the final decision. Staff confirmed. The resident suggested the best way to get their thoughts about this across is to speak to their councillor. Staff confirmed.</li><li>• A resident questioned how often staff speak to councillors. Staff explained that municipal staff met monthly with councillors, plus additional public information meetings. Councillors call staff with questions and the Warden attends weekly meetings with directors.</li><li>• A resident expressed concern about a duplex and then asked how many current councillors are in favour of development. Staff stated that they do not know what is in the heads of the individual councillors, but they believe that they take their jobs seriously. Councillors are to be unbiased, to listen to the public, to read staff reports and to participate in debate.</li><li>• The resident then asked a specific personal tax question.</li><li>• A resident asked if there was a detailed hydrogeological study completed for this plan. Staff reminded residents that in depth studies were not done yet.</li><li>• A resident clarified that groundwater is not looked at in serviced areas. Staff confirmed.</li><li>• The resident suggested that serviced areas may impact un-serviced areas. Staff agreed, and acknowledged that an issue between the two would be a civil issue.</li><li>• A resident notes that two councillors represent the entire area, and that it was the residents' job to hold them accountable.</li><li>•</li></ul>
4.	Adjournment at 8:25 pm